

areas and ways that you and I might not agree with. In fact, you have taxpayers from one State who are subsidizing services for taxpayers in another State. For instance, in my State of New Jersey, I know that for every dollar that we send to Washington, we only receive back 54 cents from the Federal Government. That does not make sense to me and I know that is not fair.

Our recent leaders have tried to right this position of our Federal Government back to where our Founding Fathers had it. In his first inaugural address in 1981, President Reagan said, "It is my intention to curb the size and influence of the Federal establishment and to demand recognition of the distinction between the powers granted to the Federal Government and those reserved to the States or to the people. All of us need to be reminded that the Federal Government did not create the States; the States created the Federal Government."

In light of the looming fiscal crisis of our Federal budget and the domestic programs that are simply not reaching their intended goals, I believe it is imperative to highlight the need to return to a system intended under the reserve clause of the Constitution. I invite and encourage my colleagues to join the caucus and help us return control to those who know what is best, to the people. All of our constituents deserve the most efficient and effective government, a government in accord with our Constitution.

#### PRISONER ABUSE INVESTIGATIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McHENRY). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the call for an independent commission to review accusations of abuse of prisoners at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba and other places continues to grow. This is not a partisan issue. Members from both sides of the aisle, citizens who consider themselves progressives and citizens who consider themselves conservatives, have joined the call for such a commission. Opinion polls reflect the American people's deep concern about prisoner abuse. The security of our Nation is profoundly impacted by our reputation, by how we are viewed by the rest of the world.

Our response to terrorism is based on contrasting our values to theirs. We are conducting an ideological war in parallel with police and military operations. The outcome of both the ideological struggle and the armed struggle hinge to a significant extent on this great test of values.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, it is great shame that attention has been diverted in recent days from the fundamental issues to the words used by one Senator, a Senator whom I much admire and greatly respect, who has admitted

that the words he used were too strong and who has apologized to those whom he may have offended. The issue raised by the Senator was timely, on target, and central to our Nation's best interests, despite the fact that his specific words failed to properly frame his message.

It is imperative that we remain focused on the issue that the Senator called to our attention and not allow ourselves to be dissuaded, deterred, or discouraged from pursuing a thorough public inquiry into prisoner abuse in much the same manner as the commission we created to examine September 11.

Do some of the policies of our government endanger our troops by disparaging the image of America? Are our own troops endangered by our strained and unique interpretation of the Geneva Conventions? Has our approach to human intelligence distorted and limited our ability to understand and respond to the insurgency in Iraq and the terrorist threat in general? Do the incidents of abuse flow from decisions taken at the highest levels with regard to the conduct of American intelligence?

These are urgent and critical questions that cannot be answered adequately in the inquiries launched to date. We owe a great debt to those who have spoken out, calling for an independent commission, sometimes at great personal cost. I thank them for their leadership.

We owe a great debt to Senator RICHARD DURBIN for helping cause Americans to look seriously at this issue of prisoner abuse by our intelligence agencies and our military. I thank the Senator.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. OSBORNE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. OSBORNE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### EXCHANGE OF SPECIAL ORDER TIME

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to use the time of the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. OSBORNE).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

#### SOMATIC CELL NUCLEAR TRANSFER IS HUMAN CLONING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WELDON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the bioethical issues that we have been debating for the past several years, and particularly over the last

couple of months, deal with fundamental questions about the value of human life and the meaning of human dignity. Every poll conducted on the subject of human embryo cloning for research indicates that 70 to 80 percent of the American people oppose human embryo cloning for research purposes. Cloning advocates know that the American public is adamantly opposed to their goals, so they have crafted new speech in an attempt to deliberately mislead Members of Congress, the media, grassroots advocates and the American public.

One of the leading patient advocacy groups for human cloning research is the Juvenile Diabetes Research Foundation, and they have been sanitizing the language and playing semantic games with a willing media and an unaware American public.

Let me give you a few examples. Last year when representatives of the JDRF stopped by my office, they shared with my staff that they endorsed stem cell research involving somatic cell nuclear transfer. When my staff replied that somatic cell nuclear transfer, or SCNT, was the cloning of human embryos, the JDRF advocates in my office responded that they had been told by those training them for their Hill visit that SCNT did not create a human embryo because sperm was not used. Indeed, the literature in their own hands stated the following: "When scientists use SCNT to create stem cells, no sperm is used and the resulting cell has no chance of developing into a human being because it is never placed in a uterus. This is a fundamentally different procedure from reproductive cloning, as was used by scientists in 1996 to create Dolly the sheep."

This statement is misleading on several counts. JDRF is flat-out wrong when they state that SCNT is a "fundamentally different procedure from reproductive cloning, as was used by scientists in 1996 to create Dolly the sheep." Dr. Ian Wilmut, Dolly's own creator, does not agree with the JDRF statement. Dr. Wilmut stated clearly in a peer-reviewed article, "the unique feature of Dolly was that she was the first mammal to be cloned from an adult somatic body cell." Then he goes on to say, "The success of somatic cell nuclear transfer was used in creating Dolly."

Cloning supporter and then-NIH Director Harold Varmus testified in 1998 stating, "in the Dolly experiment, a lamb was produced using the technology of somatic cell nuclear transfer."

JDRF implies that sperm is necessary to develop an embryo capable of growing into a human. This notion is completely inaccurate, as hundreds of animals have been created through SCNT using no sperm. Was Dolly not a sheep because sperm was not involved? JDRF characterizes the resulting product of SCNT as merely a cell with no chance of developing into a "human." But President Clinton's own Bioethics